



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,033	10/12/2000	Howard J. Glaser	STL920000062US1	8030

24852 7590 05/04/2004

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP  
IP LAW  
555 BAILEY AVENUE, J46/G4  
SAN JOSE, CA 95141

EXAMINER
----------

GROSS, KENNETH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/687,033	Applicant(s) GLASER ET AL.	
	Examiner Kenneth A Gross	Art Unit 2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2004.
2. Claims 1-21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenner (U.S. Patent Number 6,314,565) in view of Stedman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,262,726) and further in view of Hsu (U.S. Patent Number 5,894,515).

In regard to Claim 1, Kenner teaches: (a) defining a configuration of the application program (Column 7, lines 5-12); and (c) building the application program according to the configuration (Column 8, lines 30-41). Kenneth does not teach that the configuration of the application program is a user configuration, nor does he teach determining that the user configuration corresponds to the particular user. Stedman, however, does teach storing user configurations of an operating system for the purposes of application customization (Column 6, lines 58-62). Neither Kenner nor Stedman teach encrypting the configuration in a manifest file, authorizing a user in response to a user request for the application program, and decrypting the manifest file to produce a decrypted configuration. Hsu, however, does teach encrypting data, authorizing a user, and in response to authorizing a user, decrypting the data (Column 1, lines

Art Unit: 2122

13-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform the method of defining a configuration of the application program and building the application program according to a configuration, where the configuration is a user configuration, as taught by Stedman, since this allows different users to access different requested software from the same machine, and the configuration is encrypted in a manifest file, authorizing a user in response to a user request for the application program, and decrypting the manifest file to produce a decrypted configuration, as taught by Hsu, since this allows the manifest to remain secure and only viewable by a specific user.

Claims 8 and 15 are method and system Claims that correspond with article of manufacture Claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 1, where Kenner teaches a method (Figure 2) and system (Figure 1) for said article of manufacture of Claim 1.

For specific rejections of Claims 4, 11, and 18, see the office action mailed on November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2003.

5. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenner (U.S. Patent Number 6,314,565) in view of Stedman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,262,726) and further in view of Hsu (U.S. Patent Number 5,894,515) and Hayes, Jr. (U.S. Patent Number 6,205,476).

For specific rejections of Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, and 21, see the office action mailed on November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2003.

*Response to Arguments*

6. Applicant's arguments filed February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Specifically, the applicant states that "the examiner does not assert that any of the cited prior art or that any combination of the cited prior art teaches or suggests the third element of Claims 1, 8, or 15: "determining that the stored user configuration corresponds to the particular user"" (Page 12). However, in the action mailed on November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2003, the examiner states on Page 2, line 12: "Stedman, however, does teach storing user configurations of an operating system for the purposes of application customization (Column 6, lines 58-62)".

The applicant further claims that the examiner's statement of motivation for combining Kenner and Stedman, "since this allows different users to access different requested software from the same machine", is based on the applicant's disclosure, which teaches "the present invention has the further advantage of allowing a user to be able to move between different workstations, and still be able to access the user's tools and data". However, these are two different concepts. Allowing multiple users to access one machine is not that same as allowing a user to access multiple machines. Stedman, in fact, does teach the motivation for user configurations in Column 2, lines 17-19: "The computer system and method may also allow for several users to use the same computer system with a separate profile and desktop layout for each user."

Finally, the applicant states that the examiner's statement of motivation for combining Kenner, Stedman, and Hsu, "since this allows the manifest to remain secure and only viewable by a specific user", is based on the applicant's disclosure, not on the prior art. The applicant

Art Unit: 2122

claims that the disclosure teaches encrypting and decrypting according to user authentication. However, encrypting data for security purposes is not new in the art, nor is authenticating a user upon accessing the encrypted data, and the need for encrypting data on a computer system or on a network is to prevent unauthorized access.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth A Gross whose telephone number is (703) 305-0542. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KAG



**TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**